

DS681

5

V4M3



*H. L. Dodge*

All just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.—DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

When we are molding in forgotten dust this sentence will live and burn, a menace to tyrants and a beacon light to the downtrodden and the oppressed.

*Know about the Govt in the District?  
We have never consented to the gov't  
that has been forced upon us by Congress.  
SPEECH  
nor has our consent been asked! On the con-  
trary, the Com<sup>OF</sup> refused to let us vote on the  
question!*

HON. WM. E. <sup>nest</sup>MASON,  
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Tuesday, January 10, 1899.

---

WASHINGTON.

1899



15681  
5  
44M3

## Government of Foreign People.

No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power—no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulders, if it is not imposed by the voice of his own nation and of his own country, he will not, he can not, and he *means* not to be happy under its burden.—*Webster*.

Tell me why we adopt one plan for Cuba and another for the Philippines

I would write in living letters upon your hearts the word "Liberty." Not liberty, Mr. President, for your family as I prescribe it, not liberty for me or my children by your dictation, not Austrian liberty for Hungary, not Spanish liberty for Cuba, not English liberty for the United States, and not American liberty for the Philippines, but universal liberty—universal liberty for which our fathers died

## SPEECH

OF

## HON. WILLIAM E. MASON.

The Senate having under consideration the following resolution:

"Whereas all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Government of the United States of America will not attempt to govern the people of any other country in the world without the consent of the people themselves, or subject them by force to our dominion against their will"—*

Mr. MASON said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is easy to drift with the tide, but not always safe. It is pleasant to remain within the harbor when the storm is on without. But sometimes the storm within, the inner conscience, is more dangerous to peace of mind than the storm without may be to human life.

The simple resolution which I have introduced, and which I shall ask a vote upon before the final passage of any material legislation or treaty upon this subject, does not have necessarily anything to do with the treaty. I do not intend to speak upon that subject.

The remarks of the learned Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY] went to the suggestion that we have no constitutional power to acquire territory except under certain conditions, and the remarks of the learned Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] in answer showed that both gentlemen had been diligent in searching for conflicting authorities, and they have convinced the

Senate, I think, that the question still is and always will be unsettled.

The proposition, however, followed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and to which I wish to invite the attention of my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER]—and he knows with what sincerity I say “my friend”—is to the effect, first, that we have no right to acquire territory for an unconstitutional purpose; second, that the Constitution must be interpreted in the light of the Declaration of Independence, and, therefore, third, that we have no right under the Constitution to acquire territory for the purpose of governing a people without their consent.

The resolution which I have offered does not involve a question of law. If I believe at any time in the future I can add to anything suggested by distinguished gentlemen, I shall have the temerity to enter that field of discussion. The resolution I offer involves a question of policy to be pursued by this Republic and requires no learned discussion of constitutional law.

Understand me, Mr. President, I am not apologizing for the resolution nor for my speech. I regret its necessity; but that it is necessary that this treaty-making body of the United States should declare itself, one side or the other, upon the fundamental principles of our Government I could demonstrate to you in a moment’s reading of the current literature of the day. Could I show its necessity better than reading one or two extracts from leading journals describing the situation of our troops about the town of Iloilo? One of the great papers of this country says:

In any case the insurgent flag at Iloilo will have to come down and give place to the Stars and Stripes. The fact that no American troops were present at the surrender of the town has nothing to do with the case. The American forces have taken the whole Philippine group and concluded a treaty of peace with Spain by which the islands have all come under the American flag. \* \* \* But peace and authority must be maintained; and if the Malay rebel factions can not realize this peaceably, they must be taught the fact in a way that they will understand.

In another place:

To raise any other flag than the Stars and Stripes over any town in the Philippine Islands will henceforth be an act of rebellion against the established power of the United States and will have to be dealt with accordingly.

From this morning’s paper I read just one sentence to show that we are entering upon a state of war with the natives of the island, whose only crime is a desire to

govern themselves and defend their homes. This is from an editorial in this morning's paper:

That it may mean a long war to suppress the outlaws—

That is what King George called Washington, you remember—

and establish American authority over every foot of the Philippines can not deter the Government from the use of force at the earliest practicable moment.

So much, Mr. President, for the situation of the hour, a situation which was not unanticipated by any man who could think fifteen minutes ahead of the present moment, a situation which was as inexorable and as sure of coming as the night follows day.

Then, Mr. President, I ask only an indorsement of the Declaration of Independence. Surely American gentlemen will not sneer at my simplicity. Surely American gentlemen have not outgrown this document; and if they have, they will have to pardon me that I have not mentally, morally, and loyally kept pace with them in their wonderful growth.

I appreciate and agree with President Lincoln, who said, "In the long run you can trust the people;" but I want the people to hear both sides of this question before the verdict is rendered.

Distinguished editors, writers, and statesmen tell us, and tell me almost constantly, that this doctrine of governing those people without their consent is a part of the platform of the Republican party, and they would discipline me because of my opposition. Who dares speak for the Republican party before its convention meets? Who holds in his hand the voice of that great body of liberty-loving men?

That party sprang from the womb of conscience; its first great fight was for human liberty; and if I may prophesy, as other gentlemen are indulged in prophecy, I prophesy that when the Republican party meets again in convention, if the delegates represent the conscience of its constituents, the old plank for human liberty will go in again, and the rafters of our convention hall will ring again and again, and yet again, when we declare, as we will, for independence in the Philippine Islands, as we did two years ago for independence for the people of Cuba.

Mr. President, I may be charged with speaking for rebels. When did they take the oath of allegiance to our flag? Name the hour when they have not claimed the

right of independence. I am speaking one word for the Philippine Islands, but I am speaking two words for my own country. A boy treading upon an ant, his father said, "Don't, my boy; that is cruel." A learned man said, "The ant has no nerve centers and can not suffer." "Ah," said the father, "I am speaking one word for the ant and two words for my boy." A black man thanked a Senator here the other day. He said, "I thank you, Mr. Senator, for what you have said for my race." The Senator said, "I was speaking one word for your race and two for mine." The one thing that has dwarfed the white race more than any other is the stooping of a hundred years of the white man to hold the black man down. If I am to be branded as speaking for rebels, let me say at the outset I am speaking more for my country than for them.

We have learned, and must learn again and again, the simple lesson of the law of compensation. That law is as unfailing as the law of gravitation. There is no vicarious atonement for a nation's crime. I care not what your religious faith may be, no nation has ever committed a crime against a weaker nation or against her own citizens that the law of compensation has not demanded settlement. For a hundred years in this country we piled up the wealth of unrequited toil of the slaves. We said, "This is the land of the free and the home of the brave," and sold women and children to the highest and best bidder for cash. No picture could be painted of the genius of our country in which the slave pen and whipping post did not rear their heads. We tore down the slave pen; the auction block came down with it; but there was not material enough to make headboards for the graves.

It is with the law of liberty as it is with the law of love—the more you give the more you have. Mr. President, if you, by your prejudice against me, bind me in a chain, your soul, as well as mine, feels the imprint of the bond. When Lincoln, as the instrument of God, struck the shackles from a million slaves, he struck the same shackles from your arms and from mine as well.

You can not govern the Philippine Islands without taxing them. You have not yet their consent to tax them. You propose again to tax without representation. Look out for tea parties. Those semisocial functions are liable to occur, for Yankee Doodle and the Star-Spangled Banner have been heard in the Archipelago.



Mr. President, in the light of the construction given to liberty by one of the distinguished Senators of this body, who has amended the Declaration of Independence in his speech here by inserting the words "some of the people," let me read, in the light of that definition, the definition of liberty as given by Webster. You remember Kossuth, the great liberator and lover of liberty. He came here in 1851, and you remember how he stirred the hearts of the American people here in Washington long before we had heard of this new interpretation that government was for "some of the people." When Kossuth made his speech in Washington, Webster replied. Remember, Senators, I do not claim any monopoly on liberty. I do not claim for a moment that I love it any more than do you; but I beg and I pray you to hear this man's definition of liberty—not liberty for me fixed by you. I read from Kossuth's Speeches, page 159. Webster said:

There is, gentlemen, the great element of human happiness mixed up with other. We have our social affections; we have our family affections; but then we have this sentiment of our country, which imbues all our hearts and enters into all our other feelings; and this sentiment of country is an affection not only for the soil on which we were born; it not only appertains to our parents and sisters and brothers and friends, but our habits and institutions, and to the government of that country in all respects.

We may talk of it as we please, but there is nothing that satisfies the human mind in an enlightened age unless man is governed by his own country and the institutions of his own government.

Hear this sentence, and remember this if you forget all I shall say to-day.

No matter how easy the yoke, though our dearly beloved friends who are going to govern the Philippines may use a silken cord, a golden chain; Webster says:

No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power—

And we are a foreign power so far as the Philippines are concerned; we can not speak their language; we can not read their newspapers—

No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power—no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulders, if it is not imposed by the voice of his own nation and of his own country, he will not, he can not, and he *means* not to be happy under its burden.

No matter how easy the yoke, he means not to be happy. But, Mr. President, we are told that they can not govern themselves. Where is the student of evolution who talks like this? Where is the man who has read who does not know that all government is made to fit the people and does not rise either above or below the people themselves? Who does not know the difference

between "canned liberty," as the distinguished Speaker of the House calls it, and the genuine liberty which we enjoy?

No, no; they can not govern themselves. I was told so the other day by one of my beloved constituents, who never governs himself fifteen minutes at a time; but he was willing to take an assignment under the present Administration to govern all the Philippines at a fair salary.

Can not govern themselves! Every man who ever owned a slave always said: "Why, you poor, downtrodden slave, I own you for your own good, just to help you; I eat my bread in the sweat of your face just to keep you safe and sound from the ways of danger; and in order that I may continue to exercise this Christian duty do not let me catch you with a spelling book in your hand."

Can not govern themselves! And we are to say that to-day to the poor, God-forsaken, downtrodden people of the Philippine Islands; and while we whisper the words of consolation into their ears that we are to give them liberty and life, we wink the other eye to the merchants of the country, and say: "We will extend commerce and sell more calico." [Laughter.] My distinguished friend suggested this morning that we ought to rake those islands with our guns and compel their people to wear shirts—not that they need the shirts, but to increase the demand for calico.

We are to go to those people and say to them, notwithstanding Dewey said they are competent to govern themselves—he had handled them without guns; he had had no trouble with them; he had an understanding—we are to say to the people of the Philippine Islands, "You poor, God-forsaken creatures, this thing of sovereignty is a great thing; we bought yours somewhere across the water."

Mr. President, did you ever see the Passion Play? Were you reminded when you saw the picture of gentlemen in foreign lands parting and dividing the homes of the Filipinos without consulting them and without notice to the people who live there—were you reminded of the picture in the Passion Play where the garments of the Master were parted by the throw of the dice?

But we are to exercise the right of taxation without representation. We are to govern the ad valorem and the specific duties. Ah, my friends, look out; for once the spirit of imperialism governs the poor and weak

10,000 miles away, look out that that spirit does not touch you nearer home.

When Kossuth wrote the declaration of Hungarian independence he had in mind our own Declaration of Independence. So he said here in Washington. For over one hundred years every lover of liberty has pointed to this sentence within this resolution: "All just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed."

This sentence, Mr. President, has been a pillar of fire by night and a cloud by day to the downtrodden and oppressed all over the world. In the light of this sentence crowns have fallen to the dust and men have stood anew in their own manhood. In the light of this sentence Simon Bolivar, the liberator of South America, laid in blood and carnage the foundation stones of the South American republics. In the light of this sentence Kosciusko led his Spartan band against the hosts of Russian and Austrian oppressors of his native Poland.

This burning sentence attracted the attention of Lafayette, across the water, and his ships set sail for our relief. In the light of this sentence Garibaldi struck down Bourbon tyranny and carved his name not only in the hearts of lovers of liberty in Italy, but all over the world. No, Mr. President, we will not amend that sentence now. We will not insert the word "some" just yet. It has passed beyond the power of this country to amend the Declaration of Independence, and when the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and I, and all the rest of us, are moldering in forgotten dust; that sentence will continue to live and to burn, a menace to tyrants and a beacon light to the downtrodden and the oppressed.

You ask for expansion. See how we have expanded in the time since this sentence was written. Not only have republics started up in place of monarchies, but monarchies have themselves gradually broadened into constitutional governments, getting nearer and nearer to the voice of the people. Our own was the first great republic, and in the better and broader sense our flag floats from the dome of every republic. From Brazil to Nicaragua and Venezuela the brave little republican flag is floating. It may not be striped or starred like our own, but it is born of the spirit of our spirit, and it breathes defiance to the monarchies of the world, because our flag is in our sky and because the Monroe doctrine is written forever in the hearts of the people.

We are told by others that we must govern the Philippine Islands or abandon them and turn them back to Spain. Are we going to do that with Cuba? Is that our promise to the people of Cuba, that we must either take that island or give it to some other tyrant than Spain? Oh, no. We have said to Cuba, "Go along, my little friend; there is your flag and there is your new republic; you are a friend of the great Republic and not its slave. We have helped to set your flag in the sky. Go on, my brave young republic, and while Yankee Doodle is whistled on this continent no foreign power shall ever invade your soil." Have we got to govern or abandon Cuba? Is that an honest excuse for grabbing something in violation of the common, honest law of nations?

Let me tell you what our good friend Fox said in the English Parliament, that some of you expansionists read when you were boys and have long since forgotten. I quote his exact language, and I quote the volume of Fox's Speeches, at page 61:

The noble lord who moved the amendment said that we were in the dilemma of conquering or abandoning America. What have been the advantages of America to this Kingdom? Extent of trade, increase of commercial advantages, and a numerous people growing up in the same ideas and sentiments as ourselves. Now, sir, would those advantages accrue to us if America was conquered? Not one of them.

Let me read just a little further from what Fox said in answer to this proposition, made so far by all the people who are in favor of taking the Philippine Islands, whether the people of those islands want us to do so or not. Fox, following on in the same speech on the same day, in reply to the Crown, said:

Such a possession of America must be secured by a standing army—

Is not that true here?—

and that, let me observe, must be a very considerable army.

Is not that true here? Aguinaldo has 50,000 men and one climate. Mr. Fox, continuing, said:

Consider, sir, that that army must be cut off from the intercourse of social liberty here, and accustomed in every instance to bow down and break the spirits of men, to trample on the rights and live on the spoils cruelly wrung from the sweat and labor of their fellow-subjects. Such an army employed for such purposes, and paid by such means, for supporting such principles, would be a very proper instrument to effect points of a greater, or at least more favorite, importance nearer home; points, perhaps, very unfavorable to the liberties of this country.

Not one expansionist, not one who advocates the tak-

ing of these islands against the consent of the people, but what will tell you in the same breath, "Yes, it is going to be a great tax upon the people of the United States, but we will let the Filipinos pay that tax." They are to pay for our standing army. They are to pay the price of their own chains.

Mr. President, suppose England had accepted that advice of Fox, the great lover of liberty? They said he was America's friend. Ah, but in the light of history he was a better friend to England. If England had accepted that advice and made us their friend, the hundred years last passed would have shown a different state of affairs between England and the United States of America.

The Filipino, or resident of the Philippine Islands, is begging to treat with us. He knocks at our door to be heard. He loves his home as you love yours, sir, and as I love mine. He has breathed the inspiration of our history. He asks only what our fathers fought for—the right to govern himself. There is no treaty of commercial value to the United States which could be suggested that he is not ready and willing to give us. Then it is not the expansion of commerce you want, but it is the expansion of the gewgaws and the tinsels of royalty.

Those of us who pointed out in the early summer this present situation—I beg gentlemen to understand I do not want to appear in the light of "I told you so"—but those of us in the early summer who told you what would lie in wait for us if we sought to govern those people without their consent knew that it meant war for expansion, war for conquest, war in the denial of our very proposition made in this Chamber when we declared war for the liberation of Cuba.

Let me give notice to you gentlemen who expect to be in politics that if this war goes on, and if we open the guns, as we threaten to do within ten days, upon the women and children in the island of Iloilo, the father in New England will begin to plead for the father in Manila, the mother in Illinois will begin to pray for the mother in the islands of the sea, and the fathers will vote as the mothers pray. God Almighty help the party that seeks to give civilization and Christian liberty hypodermically with 13-inch guns.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILLMAN. You have stated that we are likely to have war in ten days.

Mr. MASON. No; I did not state that. I said within ten days we have served notice that before we turned our guns upon them we would give them notice to take their women and children out—Weyler.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask the Senator by what authority of law the President will begin a war with the Filipinos until the treaty is ratified and the cession is completed. Does not the protocol under which the armistice was entered into continue as the only legal status?

Mr. MASON. I so understand it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Can, then, the President order a single gun fired unless this Congress shall pass a resolution declaring war against the Filipinos—I mean legally?

Mr. MASON. No; he can not.

Have we got to fight and plead for those people in the Philippine Islands as you, Mr. President [Mr. CHANDLER in the chair], did, and as others did for the Cubans? Are we to hear Aguinaldo called a cutthroat, a robber, as we did the poor Garcia within this very Chamber, because he fought for liberty and for his own country?

Oh, but they say Aguinaldo is a self-appointed chief. That is a way of their politics there. Look about the Senate, Mr. President, and who of us is here except originally upon his own invitation?

Why, Mr. President, can not we now make those people our friends, as Fox pleaded to make America England's friend a hundred years ago? Why not give them what they ask? Why should we stingily withhold the jewel of independence? Why should we not finish this war as we began it—for humanity's sake? Why not with a free and open hand give them what we have promised to give to Cuba, and say, "Go and obey the divine injunction, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; go and learn by experience, as we did. Profit by your mistakes, as we have done. Yes, we have saved your life, Filipino, and in the future we will protect it against all comers from within or without while our flag floats." Then we shall have kept our promise, and only then.

Mr. CAFFERY. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAFFERY. I desire to know whether at the time the Spanish fleet was sunk in the harbor of Manila the Spaniards held any more foothold in the Philippine Islands than they did in the island of Cuba, and whether the same declaration we made in regard to the independence of Cuba, based largely upon the occupation of that island by the insurgents—the Spaniards only holding the ground that their armies stood upon—does not apply with equal force to the Philippine Islands?

Mr. MASON. Absolutely; yes. The insurgents held more territory than the Spaniards. We ourselves discredited the sovereign title of Spain. We ourselves have thrown a taint upon their possessions. We ourselves, in the face of the world, have thrown a taint upon all sovereignty claimed by Spain that was held by force. Yes, the insurgents held more than the Spaniards held within their grasp, but the Spaniards were better traders. They knew how to buy and sell sovereignty better than the Filipinos, who, thank God, have not learned it, and we ought never to begin to teach them.

I am for the independence of the people of the Philippine Islands, as I am for independence of the people of Cuba. I am bound by a solemn promise made in this Chamber. Senators may higggle and say it is not nominated in the bond; but it is an implied promise, more sacred to an honorable gentleman than though it were written in blood.

Mr. President, let us say to them, as we have said to Cuba, "Go on your way; learn by evolution"—for that is the only way. "The use of power develops power. You can not learn to swim outside of water. You may take lessons in swimming each summer, my dear Filipinos; we will send you 4,000 teachers of swimming; but you had better not get in out of your depth until you have taken a trial yourselves." Give them the independence they plead for, and we shall have kept our promise with the people of the world.

Anything else will be the breaking of a national promise and a personal disgrace to 70,000,000 people. Then we can say to the world, "See, there is Bedloe's Island; the Goddess of Liberty has not changed the liberty cap for a crown; the goddess has turned on her pedestal and with her mighty searchlight sweeps the continent to Cuba; aye, and across the water 10,000 miles away the seed sown at Concord has taken root;

there is a new flag in the sky—not the flag of the Western giant, with 70,000,000 people back of it, seeking to extend territory and accomplish sovereignty, but the brave little republican flag which flaunts its saucy colors in the very portals of the Orient.

But, Mr. President, to abandon them as Fox proposed to abandon America means self-government. It is time enough for us to say they can not govern themselves when we have given them a trial.

Oh, the glory of responsibility! You have seen common jackknife lawyers make good judges because they were elected to the bench. They found responsibility, and it made them men. Soldiers fight better in uniform, for they fear to disgrace themselves by retreat. They disgrace the country whose colors they wear. Citizens grow in responsibility when panoplied with citizenship, and the reverse is true when they are denied that sacred offering. To abandon the Philippines means what? It means what Fox meant for the United States—the right to govern themselves.

That we have assisted the Filipinos is undoubtedly true. That they assisted us is also true. We are told that Aguinaldo could not have got back there but for Dewey. Then Dewey put him back. Then under all the laws of common honesty he is an ally. Under all the laws of nations he is our ally. Cæsar, with all his cruelty, aye, Nero, never accepted the assistance of an ally and whipped his enemy and then turned his guns upon the men who helped him.

I say respectfully that there is no more right or necessity of our governing the Philippine Islands than there is of governing Venezuela, Brazil, Nicaragua, or any other South American state without the consent of its people. Certainly we have no more right to govern them than we have to govern Cuba. Our Government is committed to the withdrawal of our troops from Cuba as soon as peace is restored and a government established.

Will some one tell me, Mr. President, will some of the gentlemen who are to follow upon the other side of the case, who are to belittle the dangers of war with an innocent people, tell me why it is that we should apply a different rule to the Philippines from that we do to Cuba? Will my distinguished friend to-morrow tell this Chamber? I can not believe that he will take the position; but if he does, will he give the rule in ethics and good morals that leads us to take a different stand toward the



people of the Philippines, who are more enlightened and better educated, have more newspapers and better schools, from that we take toward Cuba?

Tell me why we should adopt one plan for Cuba and another for the Philippines. Do you say, with the explosionists—I mean the expansionists, “We promised we would not steal Cuba, but we did not promise not to steal the Philippines?” Do you say, with Shylock, “Is it so nominated in the bond?” You remember Jacques in the Two Orphans was charged with stealing a coat. He said, “You lie; it was a cloak.” Will you tell me, please, how grand larceny and criminal aggression in Cuba become high Christian civilization in the Philippines? Is there some place in the Pacific Ocean where we change the code of ethics and good morals as we change the calendar and the ship’s clock in crossing?

Mr. President, we can not teach them to govern themselves. There is only one road to self-government. That is through the gate of responsibility, along the rough and rugged road of experience. You can not teach liberty and self-government with a Mauser gun. Spain has tried it for centuries; at least, with guns similar if not of the same pattern. For centuries she has been for expansion, more land, more property, more poor people she could ride over with some cheap politician with a crown on his head. Are we going to keep the crown room there that Spain occupied? Is the throne room to be kept intact for Tammany Hall or the Republican party when we send our envoys there?

Spain is an expansionist and has been for centuries. And say, my friends, have you forgotten the first rule proved by all history, without exception, that every square inch of territory taken by force has to be held by force? Go to your children who are in the first year of the high school, and they will tell you the rule, that in all history every square foot of ground taken by force from an alien nation has to be kept by force. There is Alsace-Lorraine, between Germany and France. A standing army is kept there on both sides, and there is a continuing threat of war. Are we to continue to imitate Spain? She has believed in the expansion of territory, expansion of commerce by force, without the consent of the governed, and her ships are lying at the bottom of the sea. Her men are rotting in the ocean and upon the land all over the world. Her flag has been dishonored, disgraced, defeated, and sent back to

her peninsula, and the golden crown of imperialism that she has sought against the will of the people has turned to ashes in her palsied hands.

But distinguished gentlemen who claim a monopoly of patriotism, who do not seem to observe the difference between expansion and explosion, say that we who believe in getting the consent of the governed before we govern them want to give back the Philippines to Spain. Everyone who makes the statement knows that is not what we want. May I repeat the old story of Lincoln? Driving in his carriage one day, he alighted to turn a tumblebug to his legs. Replying to the Cabinet minister within the carriage, he said: "I merely wanted to give him a show with all the other bugs of his class." He did not want to annex the bug or to tell him how to run his business. He did not seek to tax him or to tell him that he did not know how to govern his bugship. He set him along the highroad, along the line of the survival of the fittest.

Do you remember when Mexico was invaded by the French and Uncle Sam said, "Go; there is the Monroe doctrine; Mexico is covered by the shadow of its wing," and the French soldiers left, and the brave little Republic of Mexico is slowly but surely climbing the ladder to a better education, a better civilization. Ah, Mr. President, that is the expansion I believe in. That is the imperialism the fathers taught.

Venezuela, within three years, was assaulted by England—sought to be despoiled of her port of entry. Grover Cleveland was President of the United States, and he said to the greatest naval power of the world, "Stop!" You know the result. Venezuela, struggling along, improving in civil and religious liberty, is climbing higher and higher the scale of civilization. We did not want to annex her when we spoke for her. We did not seek to tax and govern her, but we set her on the highroad of imperialism within herself, and that is the imperialism the fathers taught, and that is the expansion I plead for.

Mr. President, I wonder if my colleagues have forgotten the scenes of twelve months ago within this Chamber, when the distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. CHANDLER] had the floor and was for liberty and Cuba? Do you remember when some of our distinguished colleagues read to us the charge by the Germans that we were seeking territory, that Uncle Sam was a sly dog, and that we were playing the part of the

good Samaritan and had a compass under our wings to measure territory? Was there not a distinguished Senator—from New Hampshire, I think—who answered the slander by quoting the Battle Hymn of the Republic?

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,  
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me:  
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free.

Shall we change the last line and say:

Let us die to make men slaves.

Have you forgotten how we called upon the people to look this way, and we said, "Hear, O ye hills; turn, all ye people of the world; turn ye, O eyes, and see America. She worshipeth at the shrine of Him who was born in the manger. We unlimber our guns for humanity's sake. We clear our decks for the liberty of others." Are we, by turning our guns upon the natives, to say by our conduct, "Look not this way; turn in shame upon us; the money changers are in the temple of liberty; the jingle of gold and silver is heard within her walls; and we are now about to barter and dicker, to buy and sell the right to govern men and women and children without their consent."

But, Mr. President, we are told, and we were told only yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]—if you will read his closing speech, in which he replied to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], to whom I now take occasion to pay my tribute of honor and respect, such as I bear toward few men in this life—"we are going to give them liberty, but we want them to have our kind of liberty. You must be happy, my dear Filipino, but happy in the way I tell you to be happy."

I am going to read you the exact words of King George. You liberty-loving expansionists, who are going to give them civilization with guns, who are going to extend commerce at the cost of the lives of the boys of this country; when you say you are going to give them liberty, forget the difference between your liberty and theirs. Let me read you the exact words of King George, so that you may be sure to be on his side when next you spout for liberty for the Philippines.

Here is the language of his kingship George III. I am going to read you his exact words. He was "desirous of restoring to them the blessings of law and liberty." Oh, why was not Pecksniff born at that time to wear a crown? King George said exactly as you expansionists

talk to-day, exactly as the Senator from Connecticut said yesterday—he was going to give them the liberty of his kind; Connecticut liberty for the Philippine Islands [laughter]; the canned liberty that Mr. Speaker REED speaks of; the misfit liberty that has never “gone” among the nations of the world.

Let me read you what King George said. This is the father they speak of, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, when they refer him to the fathers. They did refer to the father—George III. Let me read you his exact words, and when next you strut before your constituents and say, “We are the superior race; we are the Anglo-Saxons; we have larger cloaks and can say longer prayers; we stand higher than upon the house tops; we thank God we are not as other men,” they can say, with King George, “We are going to give those poor devils the kind of liberty we want them to take, and if they do not take our liberty we will shoot them to death.” I am going to read you King George’s liberty. You can insert it in three lines of the speech of the distinguished Senator yesterday, and you could not tell whether it was the Senator from Connecticut or King George who made it:

I am desirous of restoring to them the blessings of law and liberty equally enjoyed by every British subject—

You want to strike out the word “British” and insert “American” in the gentleman’s speech yesterday; that is all—

which they have fatally and desperately exchanged for the calamities of war and the arbitrary tyranny of their chiefs.

“Chiefs,” he said. The King said “chiefs.” The Senator said “chiefs,” I think. The King referred to Washington; the Senator to Aguinaldo. Was there not an answer on the same day from the lover of liberty, Fox—not because he loved us, but because he loved liberty? In answer to the King he said on the same day, rising in his place:

But, sir, how is this blessed system of liberty to be established? By the bayonets of disciplined Hessians?

I lack originality. May I use the same language? How is the liberty to be established? You have answered by your proclamation. You say, peacefully if you can, but powder if you must. I say that the boys in blue or gray, or whatever color they fight in, enlisted to make men free. They enlisted to fight the tyrant Spain. They did not enlist to make men slaves. They did not

enlist to fight the Filipinos, and the fairest thing you can do for the American youth before you set him to shooting the women and children of the island is to give him a chance to come home.

They are not Hessians. They are not hired as butchers. They heard the lofty talk of patriotism. We were all willing to die to make men free. You have no right, after having accomplished the liberty of Cuba, to send your officers 10,000 miles away to subjugate, to kill, and to destroy the innocent natives, whose only offense is the love of wife, the love of children, and the love of home.

I ask now for some one who shall follow me to answer, did Aguinaldo go back there under the protection of our flag? If so, is he not an ally? If he is an ally, have we a right to settle terms of war and peace without consulting him and his people? Ah, but it was officially reported that our colonel in command said to them, "Give up Iloilo," and they said, "No;" and it is officially reported that our commander said, "Before we burn your town we will give you twenty-four hours to take your women and children out under the stars." I say it is reported officially that this gentleman in charge—I have forgotten the name of the colonel in charge—said that before he bombarded the town—it has not been denied; it has been reported frequently—he would give them twenty-four hours.

Mr. GALLINGER. What does the Senator mean by "officially reported?"

Mr. MASON. I suppose the word "officially" is not correct. It has not been denied, however.

Mr. GALLINGER. Currently reported.

Mr. MASON. It has been reported time after time. It is reported every morning. It is reported this morning. Read this morning's report.

Mr. TELLER. General Miller.

Mr. MASON. I think that is his name. He is going to give them twenty-four hours before opening his guns. But the friends say, "Oh, that is only a threat."

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. Does not the same report, uncontradicted anywhere, say that at the time that notice was given the people of Iloilo had established orderly civil government, with courts, police officers, and means for the collection of customs and revenues in the islands?

Mr. MASON. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. That is what they are going to overthrow.

Mr. MASON. We have never put our foot upon that island. We were not even there when the people drove the Spaniards out. The flag has never been upon the island, either by conquest or in any other way. The people are governing themselves, and we are told that we are to give them twenty-four hours—that is not so long as Weyler gave them, in some instances—for men, women, and children to move out of their homes—homes as sacred as mine is to me or yours is to you. That is to be our action against people who have never offended us; against people who have been our allies in this struggle. At the point of a gun we are to conquer our allies, having defeated the main opponent of the fight. Shade of the immortal Washington, defend us! Tears of the martyred Lincoln plead for this country at the throne of eternal justice!

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, he says that it is officially, or, modifying that statement, perhaps, currently reported that General Miller has made this threat against those people. This is a very serious matter; this discussion, I think, is a very serious matter. I am sorry it has taken place just now. I should like to ask the Senator if he has verified that statement either from the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, or the Secretary of War, and whether General Miller is acting under any instructions from the President of the United States or the Secretary of War to open fire on these people?

Mr. MASON. I will state to the Senator that I did make inquiries, but I am not at liberty to state the result. This I do know, that it is currently reported in the Associated Press——

Mr. HOAR. There has been no denial.

Mr. MASON. And there has been no denial of it for the past week. It has appeared in the papers. This morning the paper says we are going to use honeyed words, if we can, to get the island, and if not, then powder. It has come in that form day after day for the past ten days. I make my statement based now upon the reports given by the Associated Press, but I will say to the Senator that I have information that I know it has been the intention to proceed further than the use of mere kindly, honeyed words. This is admitted, that at least for a week it has been charged and not denied that they threatened them that unless they gave up possession we would bombard their town. And I say that

for a nation of 70,000,000 people to stand upon the shore of a little struggling community and threaten them is an example of cowardice almost unparalleled in the history of the world.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I of course accept the Senator's statement that he has information. I am sorry he is not at liberty to give that information to the Senate. But I do not accept his statement, or the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts just interjected, that because this has not been denied it is true. I know of no reason why the President of the United States or the Secretary of War should rush into print to deny every report circulated by the Associated Press. But of course, if the Senator has other information that is accurate and official, I am bound to accept it. I wish he might give it to the Senate and to the country.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me, it is well known to all of us that when statements have been made in the leading newspapers of the country regarding a policy or declaration of administration which is not true and might lead to a public misconception, there has been a denial. This statement has been published all over the United States, and is met by that silence which is alike ominous and convincing.

Mr. GALLINGER. To the Senator from California.

Mr. WHITE. And I trust to all sensible people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not to me, at all.

Mr. MASON. But, Mr. President, we are told by certain distinguished gentlemen who are interested in commerce, and who talk one story in the countingroom and another one in the church, that we must civilize these people. "Thank God, we are not as other men. We must bring them up to our standard in civilization." I suppose that means clothes, religion, churches, schools, and the use of all the peculiar kinds of drinks that we indulge in. Food, raiment, and the color of the necktie must be involved.

How are we going to civilize them, Mr. President? Shall we show them how to run municipalities with boodle aldermen? I see that the great chief of that ethical society known as Tammany Hall has taken sides on this question. "Take the islands," says the Tammany chief. "Civilize them." Shall we send him over there to teach the untutored Filipino cleanliness and municipal reform? Shall we teach them to worship money and the man who has it, regardless of how he

got it? Shall we send special instructors to teach them how to kill postmasters, their wives and children, if their complexion does not suit the populace? Shall we have illustrated pictures showing the works of the mob in Illinois, North Carolina, and South Carolina?

Why, Mr. President, since the signing of the protocol we have murdered more men in Illincis by the mob than they have in the Philippine Islands. Shall we take that branch of our civilization and force it upon them with a 13-inch gun? Shall we teach them, as they do in North and South Carolina, how the mobs can run the towns and kill the people? Shall we teach them how to organize trusts, so that when one gentleman is out on his yacht and is troubled with liver complaint or a trifle seasick he can float into Manila Bay and raise the price of sugar on 70,000,000 people?

Shall we teach them how to organize their legislature as we have this body, so that the minority can boss and not the majority? Shall we teach them the speech of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of "some" of the governed? Shall we send them Lincoln's Gettysburg speech amended in that way—a government of some of the people, by a part of the people, for a few of the people?

Gentlemen may say I belittle my own institutions. I do not. I should like to call attention to a few of the beams in the eye of the Americano that he may not stretch and break his neck reaching 10,000 miles away to find the mote in the eye of the Filipino.

No; I am not afraid of the result so far as my country is concerned. The distinguished Senator who sounded a keynote the like of which has not been heard in half a century in this Hall may have just grounds for apprehension, but I come from a younger community. We have stood many things, as our country has. We went through the Know-Nothing craze, the Greenback fever, the free-silver tempest, and we have come up out of it all brave and strong. Why?

Why, Mr. President? Because our Government was builded right. The just powers of the Government have been derived from the consent of the people. It is builded on a rock that can not wash away. It has within itself the wellspring of eternal youth.

And why, Mr. President, in the name of all that is generous, should we refuse the Filipino the privilege of



lighting his feeble taper at the light and heat of our flaming torch?

Mr. President, why is it that to-day in the happy land of Cuba they are preparing to celebrate their Fourth of July? Have you not read of the processions, the whites and the blacks, the men and the women and the children, the starving reconcentrados, marching and shouting, singing their *La Marseillaise*, singing their *Wacht am Rhein*, singing their *Star Spangled Banner*? Why? Because we promised them independence, and by implication we promised the same thing to the Philippine Islands.

Why is it not so to-day in the Philippine Islands? Why are they gathering their men and their guns around them? Are they not saying to us, "This war means something more than a change of masters?" Aye, Mr. President, when some gentleman who loves liberty takes this floor I beg him to tell me the reason for treating them differently from what we propose to treat the people in the island of Cuba.

What is the reason? Are human homes less sacred in the Philippines? Are human hopes and human aspirations any less sacred there? Does the father love his family less? Does not the mother sing her lullaby as well there? Is there some secret reason whereby we intend to take the sovereignty of the people and gather from them the tribute we should have gathered from the shekels of Spain?

Tell me, I say, when you have the floor, you who are going to follow peacefully and pleasantly if you can, but with gun and powder if you must, you who stand upon the platform to take the Philippine Islands regardless of the wish of the people, where in your declaration of principle have you the right to treat them differently from the people of Cuba.

Oh, but gentlemen say there is something in it. There is the sale of rum and tobacco and calico. If you want the land, there is Canada; that is nearer. Take Canada. They talk our language. But when I say that to my expansionist friend, he says, "That is different." Oh, yes; it is different, and I will tell you the difference. It is the difference between the fleet of a Victoria and the fleet of Aguinaldo. That is all the difference. There is no difference in principle, for if you have a right to take the Philippines and govern them and tax them without their consent, you have the right to take Canada.

I hope, Mr. President, the distinguished gentlemen who are to speak in favor of taking these islands by force will pardon my questions. I want them, before they sit down and after they have told the great advantage, to answer. Why not take something nearer home if it is a mere matter of advantage? Why not put the skull and crossbones of piracy upon the flag at once and take out of the Declaration of Independence that all just powers of the government are derived from the consent of the governed?

Mr. President, we have had a very serious war, glorious in its inception, for liberty. We have set the high-water mark in patriotism. When Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death," the world said, "That is the high-water mark of liberty." But here, at the close of the century, we have lifted the mark. When the President called for 100,000 men, 625,000 between sun and sun answered the call and said not "Give me liberty or give me death," but "Give liberty to the continent or give me death; I will put my life in the balance to clean the continent where my flag floats."

I have seen men dying in hospitals without a murmur. They said to me, "I am going to die; it is all right, old man." I have stood by the open graves. I have seen the mother's tears dry and her face light up with hope—aye, with pride—when it was said to her that he died in a noble cause; that he died like the Master, for others. I have seen the tears dry and the face light with pride because her son was there, having died in the cause as sacred as the Nazarene's.

But, Mr. President, when your ships come home laden from Manila with the putrid remains of our boys, and you take the coffin to the mother's door, you never will dry her tears, you never will soothe her heart, by telling her that you have extended your commerce at the cost of her dead boy.

Mr. President, who wants to govern the Philippines, let me ask in conclusion? Where is the ambitious Senator who wants to make laws at this desk to govern people 10,000 miles away? Who is the kind-hearted statesman? You can not speak their language. You do not know their schools. You can not read their newspapers. You do not know their religion. Why, I never even saw one of their newspapers. I am told there is a boggy man here who represents Aguinaldo, but I have never even seen him. I have an idea that their homes are sacred.

to them and that their government, like the fountain head, is what the people will make it; that it can never be better until they make it better, and that government can not be learned by inheritance any more than you can inherit a trade.

I have an idea that their homes are sacred, that their children are beloved, that they love their soil, and that they have their songs; that the father has his prayer, that they have a hearthstone of some kind, and that the mother has a lullaby for her babe. Who wants to govern them here? In the name of God, who wants to do it? Who craves the power to make laws for men 10,000 miles away whom you never saw? Who seeks to go there as the governor? If Democracy succeeds, tell me the name of the man in this Chamber who wants to go, covered with the tinsels, the gewgaws, and flubdubs of sovereignty that comes from royalty, and have the natives receive you and keep the flies off of your sacred person while you listen to the interpreter. What man ever breathed American air in Illinois or Wisconsin who would stoop to this?

Ah, Mr. President, the fever has run high, the temperature has been almost beyond our power to withstand. The war made heroes of all of us—some of us in our minds, some of us on the field. In the contemplation of the heroic work of Dewey and the Army and Navy we have grown so heroic that we know not where to stop; and in love of power we have forgotten the high purpose and the lofty plan upon which the declaration of war was founded.

If in my effort to-day I can get one American to think a little more of the rights of man, if I can add one comfort or one hope to the poorest, blackest, meanest, and lowest of God's creatures in the Philippine Islands, I shall be satisfied and more than paid for my effort.

I am done, Mr. President. I have not well done. I have been advised by those whom I think most of as friends to await events. But the events that I saw coming in early August are here. I could wait no longer. Some have been kind enough to say that my seat was in danger.

Why, Mr. President, I have seen the boys come home sick, and I have seen their graves; and I have seen so much of sacrifice in this cause that, as much as I love the association and the seat among you, I would give it as cheerfully as I would a crust, if my people want it,

regretting only that I have so little to give in this cause.

I had hoped for some power of language that the old masters were said to have who stood within this forum in the past. I have almost prayed for some magnetic power that I could turn the tide for the liberty of those people, for some magnetic power that I could draw you so close that I could write in living letters upon your hearts the word "Liberty." Not liberty, Mr. President, for your family as I prescribe it, not liberty for me or my children by your dictation, not Austrian liberty for Hungary, not Spanish liberty for Cuba, not English liberty for the United States, and not American liberty for the Philippines, but universal liberty—*universal liberty* for which our fathers died.

3633





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 531 535 7